UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Addr ss: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/869,406	06/05/97	BARNIKOL W	DT-2179

18M1/1223

AKO-TOREN
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
44TH FLOOR
NEW YORK NY 10020-1182

EXAMINER	
GUPTA, A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1811	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Pat nt and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	15

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. DATE MAILED:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

■ This application has been examined ■ Responsive to communication filed on ___ □ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 MONTHS from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the time period will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ■ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. □ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. □ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
4. □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. □ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. □ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ■ Claims 6-10 are pending in the application.
   Of the above claims, ___ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. □ Claims ___ have been cancelled.
3. □ Claims ___ are allowed.
4. ■ Claims 6-10 are rejected.
5. □ Claims ___ are objected to.
6. □ Claims ___ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. □ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. □ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. □ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on ___. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are □ acceptable. □ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. □ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ___ has (have) been □ approved by the examiner. □ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ___ has been □ approved. □ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ■ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 USC 119. The certified copy has □ been received □ not been received ■ been filed in parent application, serial no. 08/455,426; filed on 5-31-95.
13. □ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. □ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

08/869,406

SUBSTITUTE PTOL-326

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112
Second Paragraph

1. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

The claims are drawn to hyperpolymeric hemoglobin molecules with a size and weight which are up to several hundred times of a size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin. However, it is unclear as to what the "several hundred times the size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin" is. The speccification has provided support for the upper weight of quartenary hemoglobin but has not state what this size of hemglobin that is several hundred times the size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin is. . Accordingly, the claims is rendered indefinite because it is unclear as to the limitations of the size and weight.

First Paragraph

2. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to hyperpolymeric hemoglobin molecules with a size and weight which are up to several hundred times of a size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin. However, it is unclear as to what the "several hundred times the size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin" is. The speccification has provided support for the upper weight of quartenary hemoglobin but has not state what this size of the hyperpolymeric hemglobin that is several hundred times the size and weight of quaternary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin is. . The specification has not provided any written guidance as to definition of the weight and size of the hyperpolymeric hemoglobin claimed. Is several hundred times defined to be three hundred time larger or two hundred times larger? Furthermore, it is noted that weigh given of the quaterneary hyperpolymeric hemoglobin is disclosed to be 50000. However, the specification has not defined the units of this size. Is it 500,000 dalton, grams , g/ml, etc...?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Potzschke et al. (U)

The claims are drawn to a method of preparation of molecularly uniform hyperpolymeric hemoglobin wherein the method comprises as performing *at least one of the steps* of either fractional precipitation in $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ or fractionating chromatographically, or performing a partial fractional dissolution of the solution. The method further comprises the addition of a crosslinking agent such as glutaraldehyde.

The reference or Potzchke et al. teaches the crosslinking of hemoglobin with glutaraldehyde and then purifying the product with sephaacryl s-400 high resolution gel (see Materials and Methods). The reference also makes a clear reference to crosslinked hypopolymers (page 289).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potzschke et al.(U) in view of Bonhard et al.

The claims are drawn to a method of preparation of molecularly uniform hyperpolymeric hemoglobin wherein the method comprises as performing, at least one of the steps or all of the steps in any order, of either fractional precipitation in $(NH_4)_2SO_4$ or fractionating chromatographically, or performing a partial fractional dissolution of the solution. The method further comprises the addition of a crosslinking agent such as glutaraldehyde.

The reference of Potzchke et al. teaches the crosslinking of hypopolymers of hemoglobin with glutaraldehyde and then purifying the product with sephaacryl s-400 high resolution gel (see Materials and Methods). The disclosed method initially wash the hemoglobin with an electrolyte I solution (NaCl, KCl, $NaHCO_3$, and NaN_3), then crosslink the hemoglobin with glutaraldehyde, then purifying the product with Sephacryl S-400 high resolution gel with a NaCl, HEPES buffer, and NaN_3 as the eluent electrolyte solution. The difference between the reference and the instant application is that the reference does not teach the process of fractional precipitation with $(NH_4)_2SO_4$.

However, the reference of Bonhard et al. teach a method of cross-linking the hemoglobin solution and then diminishing the amount of uncross-linked hemoglobin by the use of Ammonium Sulfate solution (see col. 3, lines 25-35). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Ammonium Sulfate solution because this solution would precipitate any uncrosslinked-hemoglobin remaining and thus obtaining a purer crosslinked product.

As to the specific concentrations claimed, generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller , 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40C and 80C and an acid concentration between 25 and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100C and an acid concentration of 10%.). See also In re Hoeschele , 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969) (Claimed elastomeric polyurethanes which fell within the broad scope of the references were held to be unpatentable thereover because, among other reasons, there was no evidence of the criticality of the claimed ranges of molecular weight or molar proportions.). For

more recent cases applying this principle, see Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc. , 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied , 493 U.S. 975 (1989), and reversing the order of the chromatographic steps.

3. The reference of Potzchke et al. (V) has been made of record as being pertinant to applicants disclosure.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Gupta whose telephone number is (703) 308-4001.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can normally be reached on (703) 308-0254. The fax phone number of this group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Anish Gupta

C Tsang

CECILIA J. TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1800